

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-49 stand rejected. Claim 18 had been previously cancelled.

Therefore, claims 1-17 and 19-49 are pending and at issue.

As an initial matter, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections. The present Response is being submitted after the Final Office Action. However, the present Response is being made to clarify the subject matter recited in the claims such that no additional searching is required on the part of the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present Response.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12, 14-17, 21-23, 27, 29-31, 34-37, 41 and 44-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly obvious over Browseaccelerator (Jan. 2002). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as they are based upon either a misunderstanding of the present claims and/or a mischaracterization of the cited reference.

Specifically, independent claim 1 is directed to a method of anticipating the trustworthiness of an internet site based upon predetermined criteria. Claim 1 recites, amongst other steps, determining an amount of the criteria the content complies with and creating an analytical result as an indicator of trustworthiness of the internet site. The cited reference simply fails to disclose or suggest such steps. The Office Action alleges that the cited reference creates an analytical result as an indicator of trustworthiness. However, referring to the “7 distinct advantages,” the cited reference does not create any sort of analytical result as recited in the present claims. More specifically, the cited reference simply lists facts concerning the requested internet site, including the site age, postal and mail addresses and the like. These facts are not analyzed in any manner such that they could be construed to be an analytical result. Listing

facts, as found in the cited reference, is not the same as creating an analytical result as there is absolutely no analysis involved in simply listing facts relating to an internet site. In other words, by simply listing these facts, an internet user must still independently determine how the facts relate to the trustworthiness of the web site as the Browseaccelerator has not performed any analysis of the facts.

The present application, on the other hand, describes and claims various methods to create an analytical result, such as by assigning point values to various criteria (which may include some of the facts listed in the cited reference) and compiling the total point value to provide an analytical result which is used as an indicator of the trustworthiness of the internet site. This analytical result provides an accurate and immediate means to convey the trustworthiness to the internet user. Accordingly, the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest at least the step of creating an analytical result as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejections of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 30 recites a similar step of creating an analytical result based on the criteria with which the internet site complies. Therefore, for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claim 30 should also be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 29 recites a system with further specifics on how an analytical result is created. Specifically, the system includes means for summing the number point values for each criterion the internet site meets and a means to create the analytical result. The cited reference obviously fails to disclose or suggest means for summing the number point values for each criterion the internet site meets as no number point values are created for the criterion in the cited reference. As presented above, the cited reference merely lists facts relating to the website and

thus does not sum any sort of number point values for the criterion. Therefore, for this additional reason, the rejections of independent claim 29 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14-17, 21-23, 27, 31, 34-37, 41 and 44-49 depend from independent claims 1, 29 and 30. Therefore, for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to the independent claims, the rejection of the dependent claims should also be withdrawn.

Furthermore, these dependent claims more specifically recite the features of the independent claims. For example, claims 4, 5, 19 and 34 recite wherein the step of creating an analytical result includes awarding numerical points for each criterion. Again, the cited reference does not award points, it simply lists facts relating to an internet site. Similarly, claims 17, 32 and 43 recite wherein the step of creating an analytical result includes creating a numerical representation of the anticipated trustworthiness. Again, the cited reference simply lists facts relating to an internet site and does not create a numerical representation. For these additional reasons, the rejections of the dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 9-11, 13, 17, 20, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-34, 38-40, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Browseaccelerator. For the same reasons as presented above, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

[cont'd]

If any fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (35041-400300) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
131 South Dearborn Street
Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603
312-460-5000

By 

Joseph H. Herron

Reg. No. 53,019